

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. II.

FEBRUARY, 1922.

No. 2.

---

## The "Angel of the Lord" in the Old Testament.

PAUL E. KRETZMANN, PH. D., St. Louis, Mo.

The doctrine of the "Angel of Jehovah" (*malak Jehovah*, also called *malak ha Elohim*) is one of the most important and, in a way, also most difficult points in the Old Testament, on which, moreover, even from the time of the early Church, there have been two diametrical views.

The first class of commentators and dogmaticians holds that the *malak* is a mere created angel, in whom Jehovah is and of whom God makes use as the instrument and organ of His self-manifestation. This view was held by the ancient synagog, not only as a matter of course, but also as a matter of policy. In a way, it is not surprising, either, that the *Clementine Homilies* understood the term in this manner. The same idea is held by Augustine, by Jerome, and by Gregory the Great, and defended outright by Theodore and Theodoret. It has found the general approval of the Catholic theologians under the influence of their view of the adoration of angels. It is accepted by the Socinians, Arminians, and Rationalists, from their opposition to the Church doctrine of the Trinity. Individual teachers who have held out for the idea that the Angel of Jehovah is a created being are Grotius, Calixtus, and others, in post-Reformation times, and Steudel, Hofmann, Baumgarten, Kurtz, Tholuck, and even, though not so decidedly, Delitzsch, in the last century.

The second view is that the Angel of Jehovah is a self-representation of Jehovah, the second person of the Godhead, as He manifested Himself at various times in the Old Testament. This view was held by most of the Greek Fathers, by Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Eusebius. The Lutheran theologians, as one might expect, were decidedly in favor of this ex-

planation, and in modern times it has found further staunch defenders in Hengstenberg, Keil, Lange, Nitzsch, Beck, Haevernick, Ebrard, Wordsworth, Candlish, and others.

It is our aim to show herewith that the second view only is tenable on the basis of the clear words of the Bible. Let us examine the chief passages which come into consideration in their chronological order, to remove, from the start, every semblance of a systematic compilation on the basis of a preconceived notion.

The first passage is Gen. 16, 7—13, in the story of Hagar in the wilderness. It is related there that the Angel of Jehovah found her at a spring of water and promptly proceeded to question her regarding her presence in that place. It is plainly stated that the Angel, without a special divine command, on His own initiative, bade Hagar return to her mistress, that He not only promised her a son, but also a posterity which could not be numbered for multitude. So emphatically did the essence of God appear at this time that the text distinctly states: "And she called the name of Jehovah who spoke with her, Thou, God, seest me!" Thus the Angel of Jehovah is plainly identified with Jehovah Himself.

Two chapters later the story of the visit of three men to Abraham is told, Gen. 18, 2. 17. 20—33. Of these three, two are unmistakably distinguished as ordinary angels, chap. 19, 1, while the third is just as clearly shown to be and spoken of as Jehovah. But in the next chapter, 19, 24, a distinction is clearly made between Jehovah who directed the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and Jehovah in heaven. "And Jehovah caused to rain upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of the heavens." In the entire passage a distinction is clearly observed between ordinary created angels and the One who, though in the form of an angel, yet possessed and made use of divine authority.

In the second appearance to Hagar, after her expulsion with Ishmael, we read that the Angel of God (*malak Elohim*) called down from heaven, bidding her not to fear, since God had heard the voice of the boy. But immediately afterward, without change of scene, we are told: "And God opened her eyes." Again a clear case of identifying God with the Angel of God.

In the story of Isaac's sacrifice every phrase of the Angel's call to Abraham is significant. It was the Angel of Jehovah who was speaking, chap. 22, 11. 12. And yet He says: "For now I know that thou fearest God, and not hast thou spared thy son, thine only



one, *for My sake.*" A mere angel could not have spoken so boldly and assumed such divine authority without being called to order.

The last vestige of doubt is removed in the story of Jacob in Mesopotamia. Gen. 31, 11—13. For there Jacob tells his wives: "The Angel of God said to me in a dream, . . . I am the God of Bethel." During Jacob's return trip he wrestled with an angel, "the Angel," as the prophet has it, Hos. 12, 5; yet he himself states: "I have seen God face to face." The same patriarch again identifies God and this singular Angel, when he says, in his blessing of Joseph: "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk . . . , the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." Gen. 48, 16. Although he has a different name, it is the same subject which he uses for the verb.

In the story of the burning bush, Ex. 3, 2 ff., it is distinctly said that the Angel of Jehovah appeared to Moses in the bush. But immediately afterward we are told: "And Jehovah saw that he turned to see, and called to him God from the midst of the burning bush." The conclusion of the identity of Jehovah and the Angel of Jehovah is inevitable. — Of the Angel of God, who went before the army of Israel, Ex. 14, 12, it is unmistakably said that He was the Lord Himself, preceding them in a pillar of a cloud by day, and by night in a pillar of fire, Ex. 13, 21. Cf. also Ex. 23, 20—23; 32, 34. That this Angel of Jehovah was Jehovah Himself, and that Moses very properly addressed his appeal directly to Jehovah, Ex. 33, 15, 16, appears from Is. 63, 9, where we read: "The Angel of His Presence saved them: in His love and in His pity He redeemed them; and He bare them, and carried them all the days of old." — The Angel of Jehovah, who stood in Balaam's way when he went to obey the summons of the Moabite king, Num. 22, 22—35, was Jehovah Himself, for He, in His own right and authority, gives the command: "Go with the men; but only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak," v. 35, a word which Balaam himself ascribes to God, v. 38.

The same fact, however, of the identity of the Angel of Jehovah and Jehovah Himself appears after the time of Moses as well. Omitting, for the purposes of the present discussion, Josh. 5, 13—15, although its similarity to the call of Moses is very marked, we call attention to Judg. 2, 1—4, where the Angel of Jehovah addresses the children of Israel, ascribing to Himself the making of the covenant as well as other promises which could only have been made by God. In the story of Gideon also, Judg. 6, 11, 13, 16,

it is stated first that the Angel of Jehovah came to Gideon. Immediately afterward, however, Gideon addresses Him as Lord, and the text relates that Jehovah answered. Another, even more notable instance, is that of the appearance to Manoah, Judg. 13, 3—23. It is plainly stated there of the Angel of the Lord, not only that He bore the name “Wonder,” Is. 9, 6, but also that Manoah identified the Angel of Jehovah with God Himself, v. 22.

This does not by any means exhaust the list of Old Testament passages, which could rather be augmented by a considerable additional number from the later historical books and from the prophets. But the list, with its brief annotations is surely large enough to convince every unprejudiced Bible scholar of the fact that the Angel of Jehovah in the Old Testament was not a mere created angel, but is to be identified with Jehovah and, therefore, in a way, with God Himself, since the second person of the Godhead is united with the Father in one indissoluble essence. He is properly called, not only Jehovah, but also God, Gen. 32, 29—31; Hos. 12, 4. 5, and divine attributes, divine works, and divine worship are ascribed to Him. And it may be added that the Angel of Jehovah is none other than the *Logos*, who is with God from eternity, being made flesh in the person of Jesus Christ, John 1, 1—14. (Cp. Lange-Schaff, *Genesis*, 386—391; Keil, *Genesis*, 134 to 139; Hoenecke, *Dogmatik*, 2, 157—162; *Syn. Ber., Westl. Distr.*, 1909, 14—24.)

## Christian Simple-Mindedness of an Illustrious Father of Revolutionary Days.

REV. F. KOENIG, St. Louis, Mo.

After the death of John Jay of Bedford, Westchester County, N. Y., in 1829, at the ripe age of eighty-four years, a manuscript prayer was found among his papers, which sets forth his devout character in a strong light. It reads in part:—

### A PRAYER.

“Most merciful Father! who desirest not the death of a sinner, but wilt have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, give me grace so to draw nigh unto Thee as that Thou wilt condescend to draw nigh unto me; and enable me to offer unto Thee, through Thy beloved Son, supplications and thanksgivings acceptably.



"I thank Thee for my creation, and for causing me to be born in a time and land blessed with the light of Thy holy Gospel. I thank Thee for the excellent parents Thou didst give me, and for prolonging their loves and affections for me to a good old age. I thank Thee for the education, good examples, and counsels wherewith Thou hast favored me; and for the competent provision Thou hast always made for me as to the things of this world. I thank Thee for preserving me through the dangers, troubles, and sicknesses I have experienced, for Thy long-continued patience with me, and for the manifold blessings, spiritual and temporal, which Thou hast vouchsafed unto me. I thank Thee for my children, for Thy kind providence over them, for their doing and promising to do well, and for the comforts which through them I receive from Thy goodness.

"Above all I thank Thee for Thy mercy to our fallen race, as declared in Thy holy Gospel by Thy beloved Son, 'who gave Himself a ransom for all.' I thank Thee for the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, and for Thy goodness in encouraging us all to ask it. I thank Thee for the hope of remission of sins, of regeneration, and of life and happiness everlasting, through the merits and intercession of our Savior. I thank Thee for having admitted me into the covenant of this grace and mercy by Baptism; for reminding me of its duties and privileges, and for the influences of Thy Holy Spirit with which Thou hast favored me.

"Enable me, merciful Father, to understand Thy holy Gospel aright, and to distinguish the doctrines thereof from erroneous expositions of them; and bless me with that fear of offending Thee which is the beginning of wisdom. Let Thy Holy Spirit purify and unite me to my Savior forever, and enable me to cleave unto Him as unto my very life, as indeed He is. Perfect and confirm my faith, my trust, and hope of salvation in Him and in Him only. Wean me from undue and unseasonable attachments and attentions to the things of this transitory world, and raise my thoughts, desires, and affections continually unto Thee, and to the blessings of the better and eternal world which is to succeed this."

After proceeding at great length with further petitions somewhat in the style of Starck's prayers, with a redundancy of expression, he concludes: "Give me grace to meditate with faith and gratitude on Thy kind and redeeming love all the days of my life. When Thou shalt call me hence, be with me in the hour of death, and bless me with the full assurance of faith and hope, that 'I may fear no evil.'"

In his will the same simple faith shines forth. Before entering upon the disposition of his earthly affairs, he feels it incumbent upon him to make a declaration of his chief concern: "Unto Him who is the Author of all good I render sincere and humble thanks for the manifold and unmerited blessings, and especially for our redemption and salvation by His beloved Son.... Blessed be His holy name!" "I would have my funeral decent, but not ostentatious. No scarfs — no rings. Instead thereof I give two hundred dollars to any one poor deserving widow or orphan of the town, whom my children shall select."

Jay's family was of Huguenot extraction. His ancestors were among those so cruelly driven from their native land by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. They found an asylum in England. In writing the narrative of this exile for his children, Jay prefaces it by remarks pertinent to-day as well as then: "My faith in the generality of historical relations of every kind has been gradually declining for these thirty years. On various occasions I have seen accounts of events and affairs which I knew to be incorrect. Not a few of the common and current opinions respecting public men and public transactions are common and current mistakes, designedly countenanced by demagogues to promote partisan or personal purposes. The time, however, will most certainly come when the world and all that therein is will be purified in a refiner's fire. It will then be of little importance to us whether our ancestors were splendid or obscure, and whether events and characters have been truly or partially represented, or not represented at all." We can understand what he means when he writes to Gouverneur Morris: "For my part, I believe there neither is, nor will be, more than *one* history free from error."

Without show and false pride he then sets down the family tradition of their history. Before the outbreak of the persecution in 1685 a forebear of his had sent his son Augustus to England and then to Africa. Returning to his native Rochelle, Augustus found that his family had fled to England, and he himself made his escape to South Carolina; from there he gravitated to New York, where he found other Huguenots settled at New Rochelle. Of these who had left so much behind (Mark 10, 29) Jay remarks: "The beneficent care of Heaven appears to have been evidently and remarkably extended to all those persecuted exiles. Strange as it may seem, I never heard of one of them who asked or received alms. The number of refugees who settled here was considerable. They



did not disperse or settle in different parts of the country, but formed three societies or congregations; one in the city of New York, another at the Paltz, and the third at a town which they purchased and called New Rochelle. At New Rochelle they built two churches and lived in great tranquillity; none of them became rich, but they all lived comfortably."

While this might so far seem to be but the reflections of an aging man, there are abundant indications that they were long harbored even in the days of strong and fiery manhood. Jay was one of a restricted number of important and influential men in the formative period of our country. He threw in his lot with the patriots from the very beginning. His address to the people of Great Britain, translated into German by resolution of Congress, was declared by Jefferson "to be a production certainly of the finest pen in America." He was one of the commissioners to conclude the peace treaty with England in 1782. It was owing to his firmness and boldness that America became entirely independent; for he refused to treat with any nation on any but an equal footing. He was appointed first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He was nominated for Governor of New York State, elected by a majority of votes, but counted out — even then such things were possible. During his absence in England on a mission, without his knowledge, he was elected governor and served. Yet a school history will have hardly more than a mere mention of his name in connection with the Jay Treaty. Against so melancholy an aspect of fleeting human fame Jay was consciously fortified; for he writes, even in an early period of his career: "I have long been convinced that human fame was a bubble which, whether swelled by the breath of the wise, the good, the ignorant, or malicious, must burst with the globe we inhabit."

In writing to a friend in the critical year 1776, "that twenty-seven tons of powder, some saltpeter, and 300 arms have arrived, and we hear . . . of five tons of powder have arrived safe at North Carolina," he does not hesitate to insert thoughts of a more serious nature: "It gives me consolation to reflect that the human race are immortal, that my parents and friends will be divided from me only by a curtain which will soon be drawn up, and that our great and benevolent Creator will (if I please) be my guide through this vale of tears to our eternal and blessed habitation."

This is only one of many quotations showing that Jay throughout life was governed by regard for eternal verities — *Ewigkeits-*

*gedanken*. It stayed his mind in the passionate conflicts of party strife in his country's early career.

The writer can think back intelligently to the Hayes-Tilden controversy of 1876, and, of course, to all national campaigns since then, but he has a lively sensation in reading over the story of the Jay Treaty that the outbursts of partisan animosity then surpassed anything similar since that time. Washington's great authority barely sufficed to weather the storm; Hamilton, defending the treaty in public, was struck by a thrown missile; Jay was burned in effigy, and the want of a guillotine was lamented in solemn resolution. During all this turmoil Jay defended neither himself nor the treaty. "In the mean time I must do as many others have done before me — that is, regretting the depravity of some and the ignorance of a much greater number, bear with composure and fortitude the effects of each," he wrote.

The induction of an Episcopal minister in his town of Bedford called forth Jay's protest against the presumptuous claims of that denomination in regard to the power of the bishop. In a long letter to Trinity Corporation of New York City he protests against one of the prayers used in the Office of Induction: "'O holy Jesus, who hast purchased to Thyself an universal Church, and hast promised to be with the ministers of apostolic succession to the end of the world.'" — This is not the promise literally, but the promise paraphrased and expounded. The promise of our Savior is: 'And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' To what description of persons does the promise extend? is the question. . . . They who made the above paraphrase answer that it intends and extends to 'the ministers of apostolic succession.' . . . It follows . . . that our bishops and clergy offer up their prayer with the understanding that the gracious promise mentioned in it is confined to Episcopalian ministers, and therefore excludes the ministers of all other denominations of Christians. Who is there among us that can be prepared to declare, in solemn prayer, and in such positive and unqualified terms, that none but Episcopalian ministers have any part or lot in this important promise? Who is there that can be certain that the apostles, as to that promise, were not considered as the representatives of all who should become sincere and pious converts to, and believers in, the doctrines which they were sent to publish and to teach? . . . Great, indeed, must be the confidence and hardihood of those advocates of this construction of the promise who can, without hesitation, deny that our blessed Re-



deemer was with those non-Episcopalian ministers and congregations amounting to several hundred thousands who for His sake endured all the varieties and rigors of persecution. If the great Captain of our Salvation was not with them, how and by whom were they enabled to meet and sustain such trials so firmly, to resist the adversary so resolutely, and to fight the good fight of faith so triumphantly?"

In less than twelve months after his retirement from public life, he lost his faithful wife. Immediately on perceiving that the spirit had taken its flight, he led his children into an adjoining room, and read to them the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

Yet he was no stoic. Writing a short time after this to a correspondent, he says: "I flatter myself that this is the last inn at which I am to stop in my journey through life. . . . Do not conclude from this that I am without cares and anxieties. . . . The truth is that, although in numerous respects I have abundant reason to be thankful, yet in others I experience the necessity of patience and resignation."

In later years Jay was instrumental in forming the American Bible Society, and was its second president. The lengthy annual addresses from his pen breathe a childlike, simple faith; they certainly would disqualify him for a chair in one of our modern schools of "theology." Speaking of certain commentators of his time, he says: "It seems they do not recollect that no man can explain what no man can understand. Those mysteries were revealed to our faith, to be believed on the credit of divine authority; and were not addressed to our mental abilities for explication."

When desired by Gouverneur Morris in 1813 to act as sponsor for his infant son, he declined by facetiously stating that he expected soon to move to a distant country, where he should not be in a capacity to attend to persons or things here.

Every morning the family of Jay, including the domestics, were summoned to prayer, and the call was repeated precisely at 9 at night, when he read to them a chapter in the Bible and concluded with a prayer. When urged in his last illness by one of the family to tell his children on what foundation he now rested his hopes, the expressive and concise reply was, "They have the Book."

Unable to attend church, he had, in his last years, the Lord's Supper administered in his chamber joined by all his children.

A Quaker friend, after a visit at Jay's house, and witnessing his family life, did not hesitate to write to him: "With respect to thyself, I had to behold and contemplate a character which appeared

to me so far removed from the world, and the defilements of flesh and spirit, as in a good degree to resemble the piety of good old Simeon," etc.

A eulogy on Jay contains the following peroration: "A halo of veneration seemed to encircle him as one belonging to another world, though lingering among us. When the tidings of his death came to us, they were received through the nation, not with sorrow and mourning, but with solemn awe, like that with which we read the mysterious passage of ancient Scripture, 'And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.'" While we may feel this a little too fulsome praise, we will not hesitate to join in the statement with which filial devotion of his son closes his father's biography: "On the whole, his life exhibits a rare, but interesting picture of the Christian patriot and statesman."

Some of our Lutherans are forging to the front, or are being pushed into public life. Let them not be forgetful of their Christian character. Let them brace themselves for true Christian testimony. With the fuller light of the Gospel which they enjoy, let them be even more consistent than men like Jay and others like him even living to-day whose names could be recorded except for the fact that their mentioning might conjure up irritating prejudices. The Lord says He needs our testimony, and He promises: "Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven." Matt. 10, 32.

---

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

**From the Augustana Synod.** — In *Augustana* (January 5) M. S. reports his visit with the Swedish Archbishop Nathan Soederblom as follows: "Upon a friendly invitation I visited the Archbishop at Upsala. His winning personality, congeniality, and pleasing manner, together with his superior learning and talents in many directions, render him a highly extraordinary man — a fact already well known. The Archbishop's heart beats in warmth for all, and his ardent desire is to unite the several evangelical church-bodies. While the Archbishop recognizes certain historical points of contact between the Swedish Church and the English Episcopal Church, he maintains an attitude of decided disapproval over against the propaganda of the Episcopal Church among the Swedes in America. The undersigned made bold to emphasize some view-points touching the renewal and strengthening of the bond of union and solidarity between the Church in Sweden and its daughter church in America. The radical theological tendencies in the modern Swedish Church, the depreciation of Luther's Small Catechism as a text-book in the public schools of



Sweden and as an expression of the positive doctrine of faith, the publication in Sweden of obscene literature that destroys morals, making the young people wild and spreading a spiritual pestilence, the granting of the Nobel prize to foreign authors of similar literature, etc.,—all these things tend to decrease the feeling among Swedish-American church-people that they belong together with the people in Sweden. In a previous issue of the Augustana Synod's Quarterly the undersigned read Dr. S. G. Youngert's treatise on the least offensive expressions in Swedish obscene literature, which were of such a character that I do not wish to take notice of the coarser expressions cited or read a single one of these books. Nor will the undersigned leave unmentioned that a younger brother in the ministry some time ago showed him some expressions in a similar publication. A leading person in the State library of New York one day sent him a book for inspection, the author of which was a foreign winner of a Nobel prize. The book is no longer issued to readers by the library in New York.—The English church language in our Swedish congregations in America came up for discussion. As means for preserving the solidarity between the mother and the daughter churches there were urged for example, annual visits in America of orthodox (*renlaeriga; sic!*) pastors from Sweden, eventually an exchange of professors, cooperation of seamen's missionaries from Sweden and from the Augustana Synod in American ports, occasionally Lutheran pastors on board of Swedish ocean steamers, a Swedish church in Washington, etc.—As regards a closer union of the evangelical church-bodies, this is certainly a glorious ecumenical desire. However, since the differences among the views of believers are so manifest, the time may not yet have arrived for realizing this thought. The field for such a man as the Archbishop of the Swedish realm is the Lutheran Church of the world. Among us he finds conditions favorable in a high degree for becoming a unifying power among the Lutheran national churches. In a recent letter the Archbishop says: 'I believe a consolidation of the Evangelical Lutheran bodies to be both necessary and useful before we can proceed to general evangelical cooperation.'—As one of the standard-bearers of true Lutheranism the Archbishop of the Swedish realm, doctor of theology and philosophy, Nathan Soederblom, is bidden welcome by the Lutheran Church in America to the homes, schools, and churches in the New World." This fervent greeting is unduly comprehensive, and in view of the things which the interviewer found to criticize in Sweden, and which must have made the Archbishop wince, it is rather perplexing because of its inconsistency. But in it there is echoed a popular sentiment of present-day Lutheranism in Europe: the Swedish Archbishop is quoted in Europe as holding that the rehabilitation of the decrepit Lutheran Church in Europe must be brought about by Scandinavian Lutherans. D.

**From the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America.**—In the *Lutheraneren* for December 28 K. O. Lundeborg writes on the importance of the preacher's personality for the efficacy of the Word. On the basis of Rom. 1, 16; Jas. 1, 21; Is. 55, 10, 11; Ps. 33, 9, 6;

Jer. 23, 29; Heb. 4, 12; John 5, 25, he maintains the inherent power of the Word to effect the purposes of the Lord. He points to the remarkable effects of preaching in the days of the apostles, in the first centuries of the Christian era, in the times of Luther, Spener, and Francke, of Ludwig Harms in Hermannsburg, Rosenius in Sweden, Hauge in Norway, Beek in Denmark, Spurgeon and Moody, etc. In his own Norwegian Church, he says, last year's statistics credit 71,383 sermons to pastors and 7,556 to laymen. Then he compares the results—a rather hazardous undertaking!—with this “mass of preaching,” and is disappointed, of course. But it has escaped him that Paul, Luther, all the preachers he has named felt this disappointment and expressed it. “What can be the cause of this?” he queries. The Word of God still possesses the power it had in the beginning. “It must be maintained, in the first place, that the efficacy lies in the Word itself and not in the personality of the preacher. Preaching does not add anything to, nor does it detract anything from, the power which the Word has in itself. . . . But just at this point the preacher's personality calls for consideration. The Word of the Lord cannot come forth in its fulness and power unless it becomes flesh, that is to say, unless it takes and fills the preacher's entire personality, so that the message he proclaims becomes incarnated in his person. The preacher himself becomes the Lord's messenger to the people. I wish to underscore this point that the irremissible demand which the preacher of the Word must make upon himself if he is to have some ground of hope for fruits of his preaching, is this, that the preacher himself must be permeated and transformed by the Word which he is to proclaim. As a rule, the Lord sends His message only through sanctified personalities.” Ps. 50, 16; Rom. 2, 21; Ezek. 13, 26; Jer. 23, 21. In Matt. 23, 1 we have an instance of unsanctified preachers' being permitted to hold office for a punishment. Preaching is to radiate the message which the Lord has deposited in the preacher and filled him with. John 15, 27; Acts 1, 8; 2 Cor. 4, 13; 5, 19. “It must not be a mechanical operation, a recitation of words and sentences, no matter how true and good these may be.” Ezek. 3, 10. 1. — Editorially the same organ attacks the current notion of men that they can become righteous by their own good works, and shows that this is impossible, because no genuine improvement is possible to sinful man, nor can he make returns to God for the good he has received from Him. — The following startling questions are answered in this issue: “Is it right for Lutheran congregations to have a preacher belonging to the Presbyterians to preach to them, to officiate at funerals, and in an emergency administer the Lord's Supper to the sick? No, it is not right for Lutheran congregations to practise such unionism. If any congregation among us should act thus, it would not only abandon Lutheran practise and the conditions of union to which it consented before the union, but it would also manifest a sad indifference to the truth of God's Word. . . . Is it right for our Lutheran congregation members to take part in building a ‘union’ church in which Catholic priests and Unitarian preachers shall have the right to preach alongside of our own



preachers? Is it right for our ministers to arrange for such a meeting? Would not such a procedure be 'sinful unionism'? . . . Yes, inquirer is certainly right that such a thing would be 'sinful unionism.'" The answers are correct, but the recent history of the United Norwegian Church does not support them. There are differences of degree among the varieties of unionism, but the underlying principle is the same whether I accord equal privileges to the proclaimers of two different doctrines of election or conversion, or to Lutherans and Catholics, Unitarians and Presbyterians. D.

**Australia.**—The Queensland District Synod of our Australian brethren at its convention in September, 1921, discussed a paper on "The Bible the Sole Source and Guide in Matters of Faith and Life."—Two shipments of clothing and foodstuffs and of a bale of wool were recently made by Australian Lutherans to the sufferers in Central Europe, in care of Praeses Loeffler at Hamburg. Eight bales of wool still await shipment.—The Seventh-day Adventists have launched a most vigorous campaign in South Australia for the purpose of winning adherents from the Lutheran Church and from other denominations, by spreading their literature.—Rev. Ch. Harms of Kirchheim, Victoria, resigned his charge on account of infirmity and old age.—Tentative arrangements are being made for the formation of an Australian Lutheran Laymen's League "on lines similar to those adopted by the American L. L. L., provided that this League places itself under the supervision of our Synod and its congregations." (Resolution of Queensland District Synod.)—Fifteen candidates for the ministry were graduated from Concordia College at Adelaide, "increasing the numerical strength of the ministry in the Synod by nearly twenty per cent. The reporter (W. J.) says: "If we had double the number of candidates, and more, they could all be placed and fully employed. No danger of overproduction! Our churches and missions could absorb them all."—While the Lutheran day-schools in Australia still remain closed, more intense work is done in the Sunday-schools, agreeably to a recommendation of Synod. At the South Kilkerran parish, for instance, "the children receive two hours instruction every Sunday. The parents are urged to send their children to Sunday-school regularly, and to instruct them diligently in their homes. The classes are so arranged that as much time as possible may be devoted to the individual child. The classes, therefore, are not too large. The teachers assemble every week, in spite of adverse circumstances, to prepare themselves for their work on the following Sunday." Teacher Linke leads in this work, together with the pastor. Annually the Sunday-school pupils are publicly examined. D.

**Germany.**—The "end of woman's disgrace" is seen by the *Pilger aus Sachsen* in an ordinance issued by the Senate of Hamburg, by which all brothels were closed. The order was promptly executed, the citizens giving it most loyal support. The movement against licensed prostitution is extended to the 58 other cities of Germany, where the social evil has existed under government protection. Secretary of State Dr. Lewald has announced that the time has arrived

for the closing of brothels throughout Germany, as far as it remains uncontrolled by the Entente. In the occupied territory along the Rhine (at Wiesbaden and Cologne) the French have forced the magistrates to furnish and maintain brothels for them, even in places where these institutions did not exist. Americans, who have hypocritically pointed the finger of scorn at German prostitution, have lately, to the amazement of Germany, feasted and flowered Marshal Foch, who has forced prostitution on the Germans. Are we becoming consistently inconsistent? — A German society of Lutherans that thinks it can remain in the state church and still be Lutheran calls itself "Volkskirchlicher Laienbund fuer Sachsen" (Laymen's Alliance in the People's Church for Saxony). Its main office is at Dresden, Rabenerstrasse 13, and its organ is *Der Pilger aus Sachsen*. In a series of articles on the great aims of this society we are told that the society "is permeated with the thought that what the Evangelical Lutheran state church needs is a greater consciousness and a livelier apprehension of the great treasures of the Gospel on the part of its congregations and their members, also that a more active surrender to the Gospel and the Reformation is needed, and that in the Church of the Reformation, since it is the church of the universal priesthood of believers, a more general and energetic participation in the congregational church-life is indispensable. The Laymen's Alliance in the People's Church is animated by the conviction that the new ascent of our German nation is quite materially dependent upon its religious-ethical renewal. Whoever desires the latter cannot escape desiring religion and church and evangelical Christianity and to pledge his allegiance to this position by his own act and with his own example. For 'the best church remains impotent without the cooperation of its members,' without a greater cooperation on the part of its members than that which has been rendered heretofore. We need not waste a word in argument that the ordained ministry, notwithstanding such cooperation, will remain the center of the congregation's church-life. Our evangelical people's church, more than other religious societies, claims to be the church of the universal priesthood of believers. Even Luther placed the universal priesthood strongly in the foreground, and in our days it is not an accident that almost from the first hour of the November upheaval few questions relating to the inner life of the church have been treated as extensively in speech and writing as that of the universal priesthood. The Evangelical Church should not allow the gain accruing to her from this development to slip from her. The principle of the universal priesthood of believers is essentially a religious, an esoteric principle. However, from it follows at once the Christian's right, and still more his duty of cooperation in the Church, of supplementing and propagating the preaching of the Word in everyday life, of corroborating and testifying by actual deed his membership in the Church. Luther based his call for help to the Christian princes and lords in behalf of the evangelical cause upon the spiritual priesthood. Since all Christians are in a priestly estate, it is everybody's duty in the Church to serve in an emergency, 'whoever may first be able.' And another word of Luther strikes us congenially as if it



were written for our times: 'Wherever necessity requires it, whoever may first be able, should render service as a faithful member of the entire body.' These are excellent sentiments, but they will avail nothing in a "people's church" which will be merely a revised state church. — In his little paper *Nur Selig*, of November 1, Pastor Gerss of Eydtkuhn writes on the "Confessional Church and the Protection of Minorities," and says: "Before our eyes there is now taking place a very thorough transformation of the evangelical state churches of Germany. Heretofore the legal status of these churches was that of confessional churches, that is, churches in which Holy Scripture and the confessions of the Reformation were regarded as the sole truth, and they were to be the basis and norm of all preaching, instruction, and all churchly acts. True, the confession was very much depreciated because it was not seriously enforced, and liberal theology, which denies and rejects all the foundations of the Holy Scriptures and the Catechism, was practically tolerated and treated as having equal rights with the rest. However, this was merely the practise in vogue; according to the law and the statutes the liberal faction did not possess equal rights with the others, and their being practically tolerated and treated as having equal rights could be regarded as an unlawful malpractise, which in due time might be abolished. Manifestly the situation is now changed. In the new constitutions the various tendencies (*Richtungen*), also the liberal *Richtung*, are to be legally accorded the same rights. As a result, they become utterly transformed. The church ceases to be a confessional church. The clearest evidence is furnished by the declaration that the liberals are to have equal rights with the rest. And the abolition of the confessional church is proclaimed wherever the legal protection of minorities is introduced. For this protection of minorities means that members of a congregation whose religious needs are not satisfied by the congregations' pastor shall be legally entitled to have other pastors or preachers minister to them by preaching, instruction, baptizing, administering the Lord's Supper, etc., and that the use of the church must be accorded them for these purposes. Note well, then, that the decisive element in this matter is not the Word and truth of God, but the 'religious need' of the individual. No question is ever raised whether this religious need is according to God's Word entitled to consideration in the church. If liberal members of a congregation are religiously disposed not to hear anything about man's sin, his redemption by the blood of Christ, his eternal damnation, but rather about faith in mankind, evolution of the good in man 'in the spirit and sense of the Gospel,' the gradual coming of a paradise on earth, they have the legal right to demand ministration of this kind and the use of the churches for that purpose. No doubt, this means that the truth of God's Word and liberal unbelief are legally acknowledged as possessing the same rights in the church. Of course, when this is done, the church is no longer a confessional church. As far as we can see, this legal protection of minorities is by the new constitution of the church introduced also in our Prussian state church. The majority of the so-called 'positive' churchmen seek to square them-

selves to the situation by giving their consent to the legal protection of minorities and by issuing at the same time a solemn declaration that by giving their consent they do not acknowledge the liberals as possessing equal rights with them. That is exactly the same as when some one jumps into the water with the solemn declaration that he is not going to become wet. Such declarations are senseless and untrue. They should be omitted, and instead thereof men should find the courage to tell the truth. If the legal protection of minorities because of 'religious needs' of the members of a congregation is introduced, the equal rights of the various *Richtungen*, especially of the liberals, are acknowledged. Believing Christians will then perceive where they are at. They will know that the state church is not a confessional church, but merely an external association, in which liberal unbelief is accorded equal rights with the rest. That is the view we shall have to take of the state church, and that view must determine our attitude towards, and our treatment of, the state church." In the issue for November 15 the same writer discusses "Modern Church Politics" thus: "The leading churchmen in the evangelical state churches at the present time have a difficult position to maintain. For they have to avoid all strife and controversy in the church, must keep all *Richtungen* together, and thus preserve the church. That is not a very easy task; for the *Richtungen* and kinds of belief in the church differ very much. Some believe that Christ is the true God, their Redeemer and Lord, as the Bible, the Apostolic Creed, and the Catechism declare Him. Others deny this faith absolutely and fight against it: they view Christ merely as a model man, as their own reason conceives Him. How are these two views to be satisfied and united under one confession in one church? One might well-nigh consider this an impossible feat, but modern church politics renders it possible. It is much easier than we imagine. For instance, a definite declaration is to be made in the (new) constitution of the church, that is to state what the real foundation of the church is to be and what is to be its valid norm. The believers demand that in this declaration the Confessions, especially the Apostolic Creed and Luther's Catechism, be named. The liberals, however, do not wish by any means that the Apostolic Creed and the Catechism are to be declared normative for the church. In what manner, now, are both views united, and both parties satisfied? Modern church politics really accomplishes this feat. To this end the following resolution is passed: 'The Evangelical Church is founded upon the Gospel as exhibited in the testimony of the Apostolic Creed and the Catechism of Luther. This Gospel is the inviolable basis of the Church.' Now, when believing members of the congregation ask: Have you preserved the old confessional basis for the Church? they are told: Of course, we have. Even Luther's Catechism and the Apostolic Creed; it is all there! Everything is to remain! These confessions are even called the "inviolable foundation"! What do you believers want beyond this? However, when the liberals declare: We will not have the Apostolic Creed and the Catechism as a valid norm for the Church! they are told: "Why, there is nothing said to that effect. Do you not



see the point? As the foundation of the church the constitution purposely and in express terms maintains, not the Apostolic Creed and the Catechism—oh no!—but only the Gospel that is contained in them and testified by them. What this Gospel is, is quite another question. That is a matter on which opinions differ, as everybody knows. You may hold your own opinion about this matter, and deny and reject many things that are in the Confessions; for they may not belong to the Gospel! Hence you liberals are not pledged to anything, and can rest content!” Lo and behold! the constitution is then adopted “unanimously.” Once more unanimity and peace have been gloriously preserved in the church. Another instance: the question is regarding the character of the school and religious instruction. Believing members of congregations demand religious instruction in accordance with Scripture and the Catechism, hence religious instruction of an evangelical, confessional character, and a confessional evangelical school. However, the great associations of teachers are absolutely opposed to this. They are, indeed, willing to give religious instruction, however, of an up-to-date,” “modern” kind, that is to be utterly independent of the Church. The teachers claim that they alone shall determine what kind of religious instruction they will give the children, and declare that they will, of course, not be guided by the Catechism and the Confessions of the Church, but by the prevailing modern science. What is to be done? How are these factions to be brought together? That is a very simple problem for modern church politicians. They say to believers: Certainly, we hold fast to the confessional school. You can rest easy on that point. We even organize special societies for the preservation of the confessional school; we fight for it with all our might. But at the same time the teachers’ associations are told: Of course, we do not mean to bind the teachers. The church does not mean to prescribe anything. Naturally you will impart religious instruction in accordance with “the principles of the evangelical church! But you alone may determine what those principles are, hence you can teach whatever you please. Only one thing we ask you teachers to do: for the purpose of calming the congregations do call your religious instruction ‘evangelical,’ and your school ‘confessional.’ The teachers complying with this request, (which they surely will,) all is well again. The teachers give their religious instruction without regard for the confession of the church, just as they please. The believing church-members on the other hand are told: ‘After severe fighting’ we have saved the confessional school. What more do you want? Do you not see these headlines: ‘confessional school,’ ‘religious instruction on an evangelical basis’? You have everything.—Everywhere this is nowadays the method for ‘reconciling’ and uniting believers and liberals. We wish to call attention, however, to the fact that the understanding arrived at by this method results differently for each party: the believers in every instance obtain their school, but the liberals get the kernel. The liberals obtain actual concessions, while the believers are given a sop in the form of explanations, assurances, headlines,

hence, words. The greater the concessions made to the liberals, the more numerous, 'fervent,' ringing, 'determined' the explanations issued for the assurance of believers. We leave it to our readers to answer the following questions for themselves: What will be God's verdict on this species of modern church politics? What must be the attitude of believing Christians over and against this species of church politics?" We are convinced that in the foregoing sketches the measures for keeping up the state church under the new name of people's church have been correctly described — and judged. D.

**Alsace.** — An instructive exchange of opinions is taking place among the Lutherans in Alsace on the question: What kind of a church do we need? The discussion was started by "v. d. L." in *Evangelisch-Lutherischer Friedensbote* (August 14), the author pleading for a strict application of the principle of the separation of Church and State and complaining of the toleration of false teaching and the lack of church discipline in the Alsatian state church. A "layman" replied to him (September 11 and 18), defending the state church, spite of its defects, and deprecating public criticism of the same because it might lead to withdrawal from the state church. Everybody, the writer complained, is wanting to convert the wayward state church from the evil of its way. The "Ernstes Bibelforscher" (name of the Russellites in German-speaking Europe) are calling: Come to us! Missionaries from St. Chrischona want to possess the land. "Here comes a Free Church which hails from America, I believe — Mississippi or Missouri it is said to be called — and which lives most likely upon American dollars, and evidently has great schemes in its head for occupying our country." A sequel to this article was published October 9 by C. E. L. under the caption "Being Unequally Yoked Together with Unbelievers," because the "layman" had asked for an exposition of 2 Cor. 6, 14—18. The article deprecates the application of this text to the state of affairs in the state church, which still consists of Christians differing in doctrinal views, while Paul in the passage cited attacks a form of syncretism that would consolidate paganism and Christianity in morals and cults. At the conclusion of the article the author says: "Many other points in the interesting account of our well-informed layman might be touched. We only wish to advert briefly to his judgment on the Free Church of our country. He does not like its brusqueness and aggressiveness. Neither do we. However, we can understand it. On the one hand, it is part of its vital element. The Free Church must again and again sharply stress contrasts. If it lives no longer in opposition to some one, it has no right to exist. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the path of the Free Church is a thorny one. It is subject to misconception, contempt, hostility, persecution. Since its path is thorny, its speech and writing, too, is thorny. This is in accord with the natural law of retroaction. Not to succumb to the operation of this law requires a great mind. It takes a great deal for a person when fasting to wash his face and anoint his head. Not everybody has this gift. We must take this into consideration and not feel offended.



Even if the language and writing of the Free Church is full of pricks and hurts, we shall still assume that it is well meant and proceeds from a heart jealous in behalf of the honor of the Lord and the welfare of the Church, and shall suffer it to be so, without returning like for like and furnishing a sad spectacle to the scurrilous world. Even if the hands are those of Esau, the voice is that of Jacob. Those in the Free Church are nevertheless our brethren. Toleration must prevail among brethren, and the convictions of others must be respected, even if they cannot be shared. Hence leave the Free Church alone. It does not hail from Mississippi; such an American synod does not exist. Whether it is from the Missouri Synod, I do not know; but it is likely that it is. Perhaps our layman and others too would like to know what the Missouri Synod is, and what is its teaching. On this subject more anon." Thus the quiet work of our Alsatian brethren was dragged into the lime-light and given unexpected publicity gratis. It is thus put through the normal development, and the dear workmen are being taught the truth of Psalm 76, 10: "Surely the wrath of men shall praise Thee: the remainder of wrath shalt Thou restrain." The unprovoked attack of the "layman," however, has elicited able and courteous rejoinders from our brethren in their official organ *Der Elsaessische Lutheraner* (November 15), both the editor and a member of the state church expounding the Lutheran position on the controverted points in separate articles. The Alsations in our Synod should have their attention called to the remarkable church history that is being enacted in their former home-land and should be invited to read *Der Elsaessische Lutheraner*. D.

**Poland.**—In its issue for December 4 *Der Volksfreund* completes its reprint of the 66 theses of Walther's *Die rechte Gestalt einer vom Staate unabhaengigen evangelisch-lutherischen Ortsgemeinde*, which had been running for weeks in this "weekly for the Germans of Poland in city and country." This has been one of the most thoughtful and best-aimed contributions to the discussion which is now agitating many church people in Europe: Shall we have churches entirely free from state control? and how shall they be constituted? *Der Volksfreund* is published at Lodz, Gdanskastrasse 112; price, 240 Polish currency. — The census, completed September 30, accords to Poland 26,940,000 inhabitants, not including the army, prisoners, and interned persons. The peasant population of Poland has increased from 65 to 73—80 per cent. 863 large estates, comprising 152,332 *Morgen*, have been parceled out to small farmers. In 1922 a further parceling out of 440,000 *Morgen* is to take place. In Wolhynia and White Russia 300,000 *Morgen* have been distributed to soldiers that were mustered out. Still Congressional Poland numbers 400,000 families of laborers that have no property whatever. A "Polish-American People's Bank" has been started at Cracow, it is believed, for the purpose of land speculation. — The German Baptists of Lodz have published an almanac for 1922, called *Die Warte*, with a curiously inconsistent frontispiece in two colors, which reproduces the well-known painting of Fritz von Uhde, "Suffer the Children to

Come unto Me." — At the cathedral of St. Stanislaus Kostka in Lodz the curators of public schools were solemnly installed on November 21, 1921, Bishop Tymieniecki and an American priest by the name of Gogolewski officiating. Instead of discussing education, both speakers, but especially the one who had come from America and who spoke from the pulpit, stirred up their audience with inflammatory speeches against non-Poles and non-Catholics, who were denounced as enemies of the state that must be exterminated. The Evangelical and the Jewish population have published a protest against these priestly deliverances. — The Evangelical Lutheran pastors of West Poland met in conference at Lodz on October 18, General Superintendent Bursche of Warsaw presiding, to discuss the infamous Nader Bill, now before a commission of the Polish Sejm (parliament), by which the relation of the Evangelical Church of Poland to the Sejm is to be determined. Only pastors favoring the bill are said to have been invited to the conference, which approved the bill agreeably to the wishes of the strongly pro-Polish Superintendent, who desired this action in order that he might prove to the Jesuit Father Latoslawski at the head of the Sejm commission that the "niemiecki biskup" (the German bishop = Bursche) has the support of the pastors under him. Superintendent Angerstein and a few younger pastors refused their consent. — *Der Friedensbote* is an "Evangelical Lutheran weekly for Poland," published at Lodz by Pastors Dietrich and Gerhardt, with the co-operation of Pastors Behse of Belchatow, Bierschenk of Compolno, Kratsch of Novosolnia, Loeffler of Konin, Otto of Ozorkow, City Missionary Horn, the teachers Rector M. Schmitt and G. Schwarz of Lodz, L. Doering of Petrikan, R. Klaff of Sompolno, G. Brill of Oborki, and others. In its issue for December 4 the paper concludes a harrowing account of the fearful mortality of the Germans in the Volga colonies and the martyrdom of the Lutheran Church in that district. These articles deserve to be published in pamphlet form and widely disseminated. D.

**Russia.** — Ministers are sadly in demand in this country. Since the university of Dorpat cannot supply either the quantity or the quality of the ministers wanted, a movement has been started to establish a preachers' seminary. — The German Evangelical population of Petrograd joined in a celebration of the festival of the Reformation at St. Peter's Church in that city. The Germans in this city have dwindled from 70,000 before the war to 6,000. Many of them are in Germany, and an attempt is being made to gather them into Lutheran congregations independent of the German state. The famous German parochial schools of Petrograd labor under extreme hardships, induced chiefly by the lack of books and fuel. The one connected with St. Peter's Church still numbers 600 pupils; it is conducted by Director Kleinberg and Prof. Wolfius. — The few pastors remaining in former Russia are overworked: Pastor Fehrmann at Petrograd serves St. Peter's and St. Catherine's Church and, in addition, the Reformed congregations; General Superintendent Malmgren ministers to St. Anna's congregation; Prof. Juergenson has succeeded



the late Pastor Masing at the Russian Evangelical St. Mary's Church; Pastor Frischfeld serves St. Michael's. Among the Letts Bishop Gruenberg is at work, among the Esthonians Bishop Palsa, and among the Finns Superintendent Relander. The Letts and Esthonians have jointly elected Bishop Freifoldt Archbishop. The Methodists and Baptists are reaping a rich harvest in Petrograd among the Evangelicals and the Finnish Ingermannlandians.—General Superintendent Willegerode of Moscow committed suicide in a fit of despondency; his nephew, Pastor Willegerode of St. Peter's Church, succumbed to overwork. D.

**Roumania.**—By resolution of January 11 the Evangelical Council of Seniors (*Seniorat*) in the Bukowina has been merged in the Evangelical State Church A. B. (*Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses*, that is, of the Augsburg Confession) in Transylvania, and forms henceforth a separate ecclesiastical district of the latter. D.

**Cross-Currents in Anglicanism.**—In a sermon preached at Oxford last October, Rev. H. C. Headlam, professor in Oxford University and Canon of Christ Church, treated "The Exclusiveness of Anglicanism" and in the course of his address said: "What does that exclusiveness mean? It means, first of all, the refusal to look upon as a part of the Church all those who do not come up exactly to our own formal traditions of ecclesiastical law, to refuse this church because it has no episcopacy, that church because it has not a diaconate, to say that no one who is not confirmed is a member of the Church, to deny the spiritual efficacy of the sacraments of Presbyterians or Congregationalists, to limit Christianity by our own particular presentment of it. Do we realize how absurd that must appear to those outside? You visit Scotland. There is there a Scotch Episcopal Church; it numbers sixty thousand communicants out of a population of nearly four million. It is not superior in the eloquence of its preachers or the learning of its divines or its standard of Christian piety or of missionary zeal, yet it claims to be the Church of Scotland. It may well be that it has preserved elements of religion and life which other portions of the Church have lost, but to make any claim of being the exclusive representative of the true Church in that country is ridiculous. So in the same way, if we go to America, the Protestant Episcopal Church, as it calls itself, is but a small body among the many great Protestant communities of that country. If we go to the mission-field, we find how small and unimportant and even uninspired the Anglican mission often is compared with the Presbyterian or Congregational or those of other bodies. Clearly the rigid application of our principles is landing us in something which may seem to be an absurdity. I have no objection to those whose loyalty to their Church makes them prepared to assert that theirs is a wholesome and good representation of Christendom, and they have preserved many elements essential for the United Christian Church of the future. I am as proud of the Church of England as any one, but I can see no justification for its claim to possess a monopoly of true Christianity or of churchmanship in any way. We must believe that

the commissions of our clergy are good, but we have no right to deny the commission of the ministers of other bodies, who may often excel us in their spiritual power, their spiritual influence, and their theological knowledge; we have no right to claim that we are the Church and they are not, when we see among them so many fruits of true religion. We have no right to maintain that our sacraments are true and theirs are mere barren rites, when we see the life nourished on those sacraments show such abundant sense of grace."

Based, as they are, on a rationalistic reasoning *a posteriori* as to what constitutes a true visible church, these sentences of Dr. Headlam cannot be a source of gratification to Christians outside the Anglican Church. Nor, indeed, do we expect to see in our lifetime a recession of the Church of England from its stand on orders. True, it tolerates, even now, joint services conducted by its pastors with preachers of the Free Churches (Methodists, Baptists, and non-conformists generally). Only recently two Anglican bishops, the bishop of Chelmsford and the Bishop of Calcutta, preached in two non-Anglican churches. As to the ultimate union between these two bodies, Bishop Weldon said that it was time that the divided church arrived at some definite policy of intercommunion. A unity to be desired, he said, must include large diversity, and the real problem of reunion of the Anglican with the Free Church is "to connect them in such a way as to *shed all that is unchristian on both sides* [!], and to combine both in a new and mighty growth. To combine historic order with spiritual liberty—this is the problem, and we dare not shirk it." But spiritual liberty, in the dialect of the modernists, stands for theological license, the tolerance of religious teaching that is hardly distinguishable from agnosticism. The United Church of England prophesied by Bishop Weldon must give unlimited latitude to religious licentiousness. "Historic order," of course, refers to the specific Anglican doctrine of the ministerial doctrine (as conferred only by ordination through a bishop who is in apostolic succession). Let doctrines go, but accept our ordination, that is the platform on which Anglicanism is ready to unite the churches. That this is a union which unites things to pieces is recognized by the leaders of the British Free Churches, and the exhibition of infidelity at Girton is by no means calculated to create in their hearts a feverish desire for unity with the Anglicans.

The other extreme in the Church of England is represented by a coterie both of priests and laymen who favor the substitution of the Roman Mass for the *Book of Common Prayer*. They hold the English rite to be dead. They say that it never was catholic (universal), but has ever been only national; that as Westerners, Englishmen should follow Roman directions. Some priests do not merely express their preferences for the Roman rite and work for its ultimate adoption, but independent of any action on the part of the Church, on their own authority and responsibility, alter the *Book of Common Prayer* in the interest of Roman rites. Thus the service has been amplified by the interpolation of ceremonies belonging to the Roman



canon of the Mass. The words "Behold the Lamb of God" are accompanied by the exhibition of the sacred wafer. There are Services of Benediction with the sacrament, Corpus Christi processions with the sacrament, hymns and devotions involving invocation or a confession to the blessed Virgin or the saints, even the observance of festivals such as the Assumption of Mary and the Sacred Heart.

Here and there bishops of Protestant convictions endeavor to enforce the rules of the Church. Last summer the present Bishop of Bath "descended upon one of his clergy, forbade the service of Benediction in the Church, ordered the tabernacle, a statue of Our Lady, and the Holy Water stoop removed, dismissed the rector, and summoned the church wardens,—who did not appear." But such action is merely sporadic, and the Ritualist (Romanizing) movement in the Anglican Church is keeping pace with "modernist" apostasy. Between the two, the Church of England is having a most unpleasant time. She is losing that which a church as little as an individual can afford to lose—character.

GRAEBNER.

**English Masses Demand Withdrawal of Envoy from Vatican.**—The Catholic News Service cables the following to the *New World* (Chicago) from London:—

"From various sources there are indications that a new drive is about to be made to have the British Government withdraw its minister from the Vatican. Up to the present Premier Lloyd George has resisted all attempts on the part of political Protestants to terminate the Vatican legation, and members who have raised the question in Parliament have been told very definitely that the cabinet has no intention whatever of recalling the minister.

"However, political Protestantism, which is nothing if not intriguing, is now engaged in working up sentiment in the constituencies, in the hope that imposing sounding petitions on Parliament will bring the Vatican representation to an end.

"The United Protestant Council, to which political propaganda is as the breath of life, is now interesting itself in presenting petitions to Parliament. If the statements made public by the United Protestant Council are true, these petitions against the so-called "papal envoy" come from the counties of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. Even the Channel Islands are said to have contributed their quota of Protestant protests, while the English communities abroad also are said to have voiced opposition.

"The member for Lanark presented a petition of the Scottish Reformation society for the withdrawal of the Vatican minister. Five thousand persons in the county of Gloucester and 20,000 elsewhere were supposed to have signed a petition which the member for Bristol, a fanatically militant Protestant, brought to the attention of Parliament."

The Roman Catholic coloring in this report is evident, and in the following it is still more pronounced:—

"Now a word as to how these signatures are obtained. There is a pestiferous band going around this country known as the Wyclif Poor Preachers. They travel around the country in vans, and put up in the villages. In such places they inflame the simple villagers against the ritualistic clergy and the Catholics, and when feeling is at its height, they proceed to collect signatures for their no-popery petitions. In most cases the people who sign these petitions have not the least idea as to what they are putting their names, and the whole proceeding is as flagrant a piece of politico-religious dishonesty as could be imagined, and quite worthy of the modern disciples of Wyclif."

So far the *New World* correspondent. "Flagrant piece of politico-religious dishonesty"—! When it is a question of gaining some political advantage for the Holy See, the hierarchical conscience, as every one knows, is strangely unsymmetrical. But let Protestants circulate petitions against the recognition of popery as a temporal power, and that same hierarchy calls upon high Heaven to witness the flagrancy of political underhandedness there revealed!

GRAEBNER.

**Materialistic Omniscience.**—At a meeting, September last, of the American Chemical Society and the Society of Chemical Research in the College of the City of New York, Dr. Charles Baskerville delivered an address in which he reproached his fellow-citizens with a "growing smugness of materialistic omniscience" and told them "that civilization has gone to pot." Summarizing his position to a reporter for the press after his lecture, he said: "There has been too much of the material element in our science—even in our chemistry—of recent years and too little of the spiritual.

"Though we know that the human brain works as the result of the action of material cells, there is something there that is certainly not material; something that cannot be explained on any purely materialistic hypothesis. This is the mind, the spiritual part of man, no less than the material, and, though dependent on the material for its power to express itself, of far more importance than the material.

"Science has tended to ignore and neglect this spiritual side of man. It was due largely to this neglect that science contributed so much to make the mess of civilization that resulted in the World War and all the horrors that attended it. It is due largely to this neglect of the spiritual that the world finds itself in the chaotic condition that has followed the war. Exclusive devotion to materialism explains the brutal mentality of the people for whom we once held high regard and against whom we fought; it explains the human wreckage of chaotic Russia; it explains the individual and national bickerings among those who fought and bled and loved side by side; it explains the mood of pessimism and depression that hovers about the world to-day. This is the mood which made me say that our boasted civilization has gone to pot."



Dr. Baskerville is professor of chemistry at the College of the City of New York since 1904, is the author of several chemical manuals and the discoverer of the chemical elements carolinium and berzelium.

GRAEBNER.

**Concerning Indulgences.** — In the Question Box department of the *Brooklyn Tablet* July 16, 1921, in the course of a reply to a query relating to indulgences, this answer is given: "To *sell an indulgence* would be a very serious sin; it would be simony, or the exchanging of a spiritual good for a temporal price. This oft-repeated calumny against the Church appears very prominently in all histories of Martin Luther, for it was during his time that Pope Leo X asked for funds to build St. Peter's Basilica at Rome."

In reply to this impudent piece of knavery the *Converted Catholic* (October, 1921) exhibits a number of indulgences which show the price printed on the very face of the bull. Thus for *setenta y cinco centimos de peseta* could be bought in 1890 a bull, issued May 17 of that year, by which Pope Leo XIII "has been pleased, among other favors, to grant a plenary indulgence applicable by way of suffrage to the souls in purgatory for the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine." And yet, "this oft-repeated calumny against the Church appears very prominently in all histories of Martin Luther"! Verily, "liars — past all shame — so past all truth"! MUELLER.

**The Girton Controversy.** — The Conference of "Modern Churchmen" at Girton College, Cambridge, continues to stir the religious mind of England to its very depths. The war had rolled flat all theological discussions in England. Now, suddenly the fight begins again. The men who made this concerted attack upon the creeds and beliefs of Christendom from within the pale of the Established, Anglican Church comprises deans and canons, headmasters of great colleges, fellows and tutors of the historic universities. Among the most fanatical of these apostles of agnosticisim is Mr. Major, the principal of Ripon Hall, the "modernists'" theological college at Oxford, and editor of the English "modernist" paper. Dr. Rashdall, dean of Carlisle, represents the older thought among the radicals of the Anglican Church. Both the older and the younger element adopt a position little removed from the antichristian speculations of Mr. H. G. Wells or Mr. Bernard Shaw: of a God not so much in "being" as "becoming," through the ethical progress of a humanity in which every individual is divine. It is an attitude lower religiously than that of Cicero or Seneca, who at least believed in a personal deity. Concerning their preaching an American liberal, Foakes Jackson, is constrained to say that its effect upon the modern church has been evil. He says: "Our audiences have lost the historical Christ and have not regained Him by converting Him into a social reformer, a moral legislator, a revealer of a new conception of God. . . . They are really preaching an entirely new religion, and concealing the facts even from themselves by disguising it in the phraseology of the old, which as employed by them is sometimes without meaning."

Bishop Gore, as previously reported in this monthly, has led the attack for Anglican conservatism. But the position of Dr. Gore is really a pitiable one. Years ago he wrote an essay in which he threw over much of the Old Testament as history, and denied the omniscience of Jesus. Naturally, he is out of alignment with the Evangelicals, who demand that the "modernists" have no place in the Anglican Church, with its definite creeds, and should be branded as dishonest or fired out of it. Nothing so well illustrates the predicament of Christianity in England as the altered position of Bishop Gore since the Birmingham congress twenty-eight years ago. Gore was then impeached as a heretic by Rev. J. L. Lyne because of his denial of our Lord's divinity. To-day he is considered a champion of conservative belief, who is stoutly upholding the faith once delivered to the saints!

GRAEBNER.

**Can We Afford It?** — The question may be ambiguous; but here is a list of figures which *Current Events* (Y. M. C. A., St. Louis, December, 1921) has grouped under it, no doubt for all-around conscientious consideration: —

Food luxuries .....	\$5,000,000,000
Autos, races, pleasure resorts.....	3,000,000,000
Luxurious service, including tips.....	3,000,000,000
Candy .....	462,000,000
Tobacco in various forms .....	2,500,000,000
Perfume, cosmetics, jewelry .....	2,000,000,000

Amount spent annually by Americans for luxuries, \$15,962,000,000

*Church work: —*

At home .....	\$290,000,000
Foreign missions .....	37,886,040

Grand total (not grand)..... \$327,886,040

We leave it to the reader to complete the example in simple mathematics. — *Can we afford it?*

MUELLER.

**Did They Come?** — Under the heading "Stressing the Church's Invitation" the *Christian Herald* (December, 1921) reports the application of the following vigorous methods in order to induce people "to come to Sunday-school and stay for preaching." We read: "Sunday, November 13, was designated 'Go-to-Sunday-school-and-stay-for-church Sunday' by the various schools of Dallas, Tex., and on the preceding Saturday the message went over the wires into the homes of more than 175,000 persons.

"A religious census had been taken a little earlier, which brought to the Sunday-schools information on practically every person in Dallas. When the census cards were turned in to the various churches, each pastor and Sunday-school superintendent sent out a multigraphed letter to each family for which they had cards, and urged them to attend the Sunday-school and to stay for the preaching services in that church, Sunday, November 13, with whatever personal touch the pastor and superintendent desired to put into it. Then



each name on the card was assigned to departments and classes so that each member of the household was visited before the special day, and given a specific invitation to attend a department and class.

"On Saturday the members of a general committee took the telephone book and called up every telephone subscriber in the city, saying this: 'Don't forget to come to Sunday-school and stay for preaching to-morrow morning. Tell everybody. Bring everybody.'

"The superintendent of each Sunday-school gave a number of the family cards to members of a special committee to call the telephone and say this: 'Don't fail to be present at Sunday-school and stay for preaching to-morrow.'

"By this method five distinct invitations were extended to every family in the city to come to Sunday-school and stay for preaching, namely: the general printed invitation, the special letter from pastor and superintendent, the personal call from the teacher or a member of a certain class, the general telephone call, and the specific telephone call on Saturday." In commending the zeal displayed by the Christian people at Dallas, in their effort to gather in the churchless, a note of warning may not be amiss. Good church attendance is the result of good preaching, and good preaching comes by the Word of God. Preaching the Gospel in its truth and purity is not only the means whereby men are saved, but also the method by which they are compelled to come in. Inviting people to attend church must therefore consist in the sincere and earnest application of the Gospel-message, free from every form of unionism, such as displayed at Dallas, because this renders the preaching of God's pure Word ineffective and impossible. Lutheran Christian day-schools have proved themselves a powerful agency in filling the pews, as is shown by thousands of well-attended Lutheran churches throughout our countries both in the cities and in their rural districts.

MUELLER.

**Dr. A. H. Strong Dies.** — The Rev. Dr. Augustus Hopkins Strong, noted Baptist clergyman and author, and president of Rochester Theological Seminary, recently died at Pasadena, Cal., at the age of eighty-five years. Dr. Strong represented the high, scholastic type of Calvinism, from which he departed only on the baptismal question. His *Systematic Theology* is still one of the standard text-books in Baptist schools.

MUELLER.

**Satan's School for Sinners.** — Such is the name which the *Signs of the Times* (December 13, 1921) applies to the modern movie. We read: "Popularizing crime and profiting by iniquity! What true American would not rebel at the thought of such a traffic? Scenes which a generation ago were enacted only in the backwoods by some tyrant, a fugitive from law and order, have, in this generation, been introduced into society, made popular, and offered for sale in the moving-picture theater. If we can judge the appetites and passions of American society by the pictures which receive the greatest patronage, truly our cities are in the same condition as ancient Sodom before her destruction.

"Never since the beginning of man was there a generation which received such instruction in crime as the growing generation of American youth. It is a well-recognized fact among educators that the eye is the shortest pathway to the mind. Any one conducting a propaganda of any sort usually arranges for the use of a classroom, a hall, or an auditorium, advertises for students, and systematically instructs them in the principles of his propaganda. Such advertisements as 'Another Man's Wife' and 'Is He Your Husband?' force us to conclude that the moving-picture theater is the classroom of Satan. Here the enemy of righteousness, using the latest methods, craftily pictures, in the most pleasing settings, those evils which he incites — hold-ups, vicious plottings, family quarrels, divorce scandals, innocence betrayed. Surely instruction in crime as never before will produce criminals as never before. The court records of our great cities show that two-thirds of the crimes committed are committed by younger men and women between the ages of fourteen and twenty, and many of the police maintain that it is the direct result of the lessons which they have learned in the moving-picture theater. It is claimed by the moving-picture men that the daily attendance in the motion-picture theaters in America is 20,000,000. While fathers and mothers are snugly seated by the fireside, the greater portion of America's youth are in Satan's classroom, studying evening after evening for a life of crime and paying fancy prices for their instruction. Boys and girls of tender years select as their ideal in life some degenerate actor or actress whose crimes and divorce scandals have made them infamous. The world is being rapidly prepared for the 'time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that time.' Dan. 12, 1."

The complaint voiced here is that of every Christian, and especially of every Christian pastor, whose church is depleted and whose members are corrupted through the vicious, degrading influence of the modern moving-picture theater. The evil calls for loud and earnest warning, both public and private, and no teacher, preacher, or parent dare shirk his duty. The modern picture-theater is, indeed, Satan's classroom, in which he educates millions of souls in the vices that lead to hell.

MUELLER.

**Increased Interest in Foreign Missions.** — According to the *Watchman-Examiner* (November, 1921) the number of college students who enrolled in 1920 as volunteers for service on the foreign mission field was greater than in any other year since the organization in 1888 of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions. Statistics show that thirty-five per cent. of the 1,690 missionaries who sailed from the United States and Canada in 1920 had been recruited in the colleges by the Student Volunteer Movement. Of the American universities that are taking an active interest in mission-work, Brown University is the most recent to adopt a missionary program. This university plans the establishment of a school of sociology at Shanghai College. The plans include one Brown professor, a Chinese associate professor, trained in America, several instructors, a sociological



library, a museum, a department of research, and a bureau of extension work. In Harvard University the Chinese language is being taught this year, Dr. Yuan Ren Chao being in charge of this department. It is forty years since instruction in Chinese was given at Harvard.

MUELLER.

**Masons and Knights of Columbus.** — The exchange of amicable sentiments of Grand Historian Ossian Long of the Grand Masonic Lodge of New York and Supreme Knight James A. Flaherty of the Knights of Columbus, which the papers reported at the beginning of this year, is indeed "highly significant." If it is a serious and responsible declaration, it signifies the repudiation of former practises, if not principles, by both parties. That the second party to this display of budding affection is not prepared for any policy of religious toleration while holding membership in the intolerable church of *semper eadem* Rome, goes without saying. If the entire exhibition is not to be classed with those sentimental moral resolves with which men, in a brief moment of contrition, love to cheat themselves and others about the time of the dawn of a new year, — if there is a real purpose back of this rapprochement between two hostile forces, cold realists, remembering that politics makes strange bed-fellows and that a maxim of Vatican policy is: *Tolerari potest!* begin to ask: Gentlemen, what is your game? The ordinary evolution from such an *entente cordiale* is concerted action against a common foe, or competitor, and the prize puzzle in this instance would be to find the common foe or competitor. Incidentally, how will all those good Protestants, even Lutherans, adjust themselves to the new situation, who believed that they must become Masons in order effectually to fight Rome?

D.

**Tyndale at Wittenberg.** — Valuable evidence on this controverted matter has been furnished by Dr. Preserved Smith in the July issue of the *English Historical Review*, in an article inscribed, "Englishmen at Wittenberg in the 16th Century." Dr. Smith writes: "The most interesting discovery in it is that Tyndale matriculated at the University of Wittenberg in May, 1524, under the name 'William Daltin.'" D.

**Mr. Ford and the Jews.** — It remains to be seen whether credence must be given to the recent press report that the publisher of the *Dearborn Independent* and *The International Jew* has reached an understanding on financial issues with Hebrew bankers and will cease his startling *expasé* of a Jewish world conspiracy. The latest issue of his weekly plainly contradicts this report by its calm, but earnest appeal to the Jews to meet the facts published about them by a frank acknowledgment, since they seem unable to refute them. The press report, if true, would discredit Mr. Ford's past effort. That may be all it is intended to do.

D.

## BOOK REVIEW.

**Vom Hirtenamt.** Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus, Titus und Philemon. Ausgelegt von *Dr. C. M. Zorn*. 264 pages, 5×7½. Verlag und Druck von Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen. \$1.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Our venerable friend has once more returned to his favorite occupation, that of exegetically treating connected portions of Scripture. The letters to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon are treated in this little volume with that freshness and originality which we are accustomed to find in Dr. Zorn's books, and, its narrow compass considered, with surprising attention to details of interpretation. The commentary is popular in the sense that there is very little quoting of variant interpretations. It is based, however, on a thorough study of the original and in this sense is truly a learned commentary, possessing high value, especially for the sermonizer, though he need not, probably will not, agree with Dr. Zorn on every point.

GRAEBNER.

**Immanuel.** Predigten ueber die altkirchlichen Episteln des Kirchenjahrs. *J. H. Hartenberger*, Pastor der ev.-luth. St. Johannesgemeinde zu Red Bud, Ill. Mit einem Begleitwort von *Prof. W. H. T. Dau*. 430 pages. \$3.00, postpaid. Order from Concordia Publ. House, St. Louis, Mo.

The author of this collection of sermons has earned for himself an enviable reputation as a Christian preacher whose highest privilege it is to preach Christ and Him crucified. As in his former postil, so also in the present volume, he sets forth the blessed truths of God's Word, rightly dividing between Law and Gospel. As a rule, the sermons are brief and adapted to the present needs of Christians, though his many quotations from Luther evince his due appreciation of the master preacher of the Lutheran Church. There is no attempt at oratory, yet the language is chaste and dignified, the diction simple, and the style forceful and perspicuous, while the exposition of the text shows that maturity of judgment which comes from deep and earnest study of the Bible. To the brethren in the ministry, especially to such as find the German language a hard master, Pastor Hartenberger's sermons will be of great service, not only as regards the mechanical side of sermonizing, such as expression, style, and arrangement of the material, but above all by pointing out how the splendid truths set forth in the epistle-lessons may be applied to the spiritual needs of present-day congregations, in simple, yet dignified and impressive language.

MUELLER.

**Reasonable Biblical Criticism.** *Willis J. Beecher, D. D.* 335 pages, 6×8.

A twofold object, consistently and sometimes successfully followed out, animated the author of this volume. His purpose is to counteract a biased, negative criticism of the Bible on the one hand and a false traditionalism on the other.

The Higher Criticism is defined by the author of the work as agnostic and cryptoagnostic, essentially alike in their method, though their work is differentiated by degrees of virulence in charging Scripture with errors and



the sacred penmen with constant fraud. Prof. Beecher's argument against the negative criticism is, generally, distinguished by poise, succinctness, and close reasoning. Elsewhere, as in the chapters on Jacob, Samson, and Daniel, for instance, the constructions submitted by the author in his effort to illustrate a *reasonable* criticism of the Bible are quite unsatisfactory. The second purpose of the book, as consistently carried out as the other, is the correction of a certain blind traditionalism in the reading of Scripture. Prof. Beecher would substitute "actual and vital study for the mere lethargic acceptance of a tradition." He cautions the Bible-student that one must make sure to "understand the story in the obvious meaning which it presents on its face." So far, good. However, Prof. Beecher himself has certain preconceived notions by which he is prevented from seeing the "obvious meaning" at times; and so, while these chapters are strong in their argument against the Higher Criticism, they sometimes fail to establish that "reasonable criticism" which the author would put in its place. There are concessions to a naturalistic interpretation in the author's comments on Adam's rib, the cosmology of Genesis, the Deluge, the authorship and unity of Daniel, etc. The chapters treating inspiration and days of the creation story are by no means clear, and the generalization of the word "creation" into "the divine origination of things" is quite unacceptable.

The title of the book is somewhat misleading, since it touches the problems of Old Testament criticism only, and not of the New.

GRAEBNER.

*The Sunday-school Times Co., Philadelphia:—*

**A Little Kit of Teachers' Tools.** *Philip E. Howard.* 72 pages. 75 cts.

It is always refreshing in these days of rationalism and materialism to find an author in religious circles who believes that the Bible is the Word of God, that Christ is the Savior, and that faith is wrought in the heart by the power of the Holy Spirit. Where these fundamental principles underlie an author's effort, he may hope to do some good to a world that is steeped in sin. We are pleased to say that the publisher of the *Sunday-school Times*, Philip E. Howard, considers these fundamentals in his *Little Kit of Teachers' Tools*. He says: "The teacher must *know* the Lord Jesus in order to lead the pupil to Him, not a modified Christ of speculation, but the Christ of the gospels and of personal experience. He must know the Scriptures well enough to set forth the Good News. . . . But after all that can be said about method in soul-winning is said and reiterated, there remains the one factor without which the work will never have fruitage such as we seek—the power of the Holy Spirit." Again he says: "Somehow the words 'conversion,' 'saved,' and 'lost' are fallen into disuse. Many teachers and preachers seem almost afraid to use these terms, perhaps because it is supposed that to-day we need a restatement of the Gospel in modern terms. But to turn to God, through Christ (or conversion), means to-day exactly what it meant in the earthly days of the Lord Jesus. *Saved* and *lost* may not be terms that the world likes, but it may be that it is just because these terms are so unequivocal and well understood when the facts are known that a rephrasing is desired in the hope that the line between salvation and



condemnation may be rendered less sharp and inexorable, and so the decision for Christ made less revolutionary." The book has some valuable hints to the Sunday-school teacher, but does not aim at an exhaustive study of the principles and methods of teaching. FRITZ.

*Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York:—*

**The Meaning of Service.** *Harry Emerson Fosdick.* Cloth with gilt letters. 225 pages.

This little book completes a trilogy in which the author seeks to expound in daily meditations the meaning of prayer, faith, and service. When the author had published his *Meaning of Prayer*, Rev. William W. Mead, of Brooklyn, pronounced it antichristian, upon which Dr. Fosdick, in turn, announced his "profound aversion" to Mr. Mead's interpretation of Christianity. The same spirit marks the character also of this book. It speaks of Christian service, and yet is wilfully ignorant of what true Christianity is. It speaks of Christ, yet refuses to acknowledge Christ as the divine Savior of man. Dr. Fosdick is an exponent of modern liberalism, who identifies Christianity with Unitarianism and knows of but one way to salvation—that of works. As such Dr. Fosdick cannot interpret Christian service, and his attempt to do so is a wretched failure. Rejecting Christ as the divine Redeemer and the source of love and service, his meditations have no greater value than those of Epictetus or Marcus Aurelius. Dr. Fosdick's book is as pagan as are those of the Greek and the Roman philosopher.

MUELLER.

*Lutheran Deaconess Home, Fort Wayne, Ind.:—*

**Wie ermuntert die Schrift zur Wohltaetigkeit an der Hand verschiedener Sprueche?**

A splendid essay and an urgent appeal on behalf of more earnest work as offered by the ever-widening field of Lutheran charities.

*Lutheran Deaconess Motherhouse, Milwaukee, Wis.:—*

**The Fourteenth Conference of Evangelical Lutheran Deaconess Motherhouses in the United States.**

Any one interested in the subject suggested by the title of the report will find in it data of more than passing interest. Of special value are the seven addresses delivered by various pastors engaged in the work and setting forth its aim, character, and scope.

MUELLER.

*B. M. Holt, Fargo, N. Dak.:—*

**Masonry vs. Christianity. Masonry vs. Parochial Schools.**

Two valuable tracts exposing the hatred of Masonry against Christianity and the parochial school. Brief, but convincing, and setting forth facts that ought to be known by every member of the Lutheran Church.

MUELLER.